

REMARKS

Drawings

The Examiner's objections to the drawings under 35 C.F.R. 1.83 (a) have been noted. However, in view of amendments made to the specification and claims, it is believed that no amended drawings are required.

Under this heading, the Examiner first refers to claim 3 where it specifies that the lip of the first side wall is cut through across its length producing two ends facing each other which are rejoined and says that this feature must be illustrated. Here, the Examiner's attention is respectfully drawn to the paragraph beginning in line 21 on page 8 of the specification (and continuing onto page 9). This paragraph explains how the drawings (in particular, Figure 5) show these features of claim 3. By this Amendment, this paragraph has been corrected to remove erroneous references to the lip 29 and to replace them with the correct references to the lip 24. The lip 24 is the lip of the first side wall. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the paragraph beginning in line 21 on page 8 of the specification (and continuing onto page 9), as amended hereby, clearly explains how Figure 5 illustrates the feature specified in claim 3. Therefore, it is believed that no amended drawing is required in order to illustrate the feature of claim 3.

Under this heading, also, the Examiner refers to claims 9 and 15 which specify the feature that the separated distal edge region including the lip of the second side wall is cut through and rejoined with a mitered joint having a miter angle corresponding to the predetermined angle of the corner. The Examiner states that this feature must be illustrated. However, claim 9 has been cancelled hereby, and the relevant passage in claim 15 has also been cancelled hereby. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the requirement for this feature to be illustrated no longer applies.

The Examiner then refers again to claim 9 and, in particular, to the feature of an insert wall spacing apart the distal edge portion of the first side wall and the remainder of the first side wall and having a progressively increasing and decreasing size. The Examiner says that this feature must be illustrated. Again, though, claim 9 has been cancelled hereby and this requirement can therefore no longer apply.

Finally, the Examiner refers to claim 11 and in particular to its feature that the first and third side walls form a channel for receiving the window glass. The Examiner requires this feature to be illustrated. However, by this Amendment, claim 11 is amended to delete this feature. Again, therefore, no drawing amendment is believed to be required.

Specification

Under this heading, the Examiner raises various objections under 37 C.F.R. 1.75 (d) (1) and MPEP 608.01(o).

First, the Examiner refers to claim 3 and its reference to the lip of the first side wall where it is physically separated from that side wall along the region being cut through across its length and a lengthwise-extending portion of the lip removed at the first cut to reduce the length of the lip and to produce two ends facing each other across the first cut, the two facing ends there being re-joined. The Examiner objects that the specification fails to provide proper antecedent basis for this subject-matter. However, the Examiner's attention is respectfully drawn to the paragraph beginning in line 21 on page 8 of the specification (and continuing onto page 9), as amended hereby. This paragraph, in conjunction with the drawings (in particular, Figure 5) provides antecedent basis for this feature of claim 3.

The Examiner then objects that the specification fails to provide proper antecedent basis

"for the insert wall being secured between and spacing apart the distal edge portion of the first side wall".

It is believed that the Examiner is referring to this feature as specified in claim 9 (the sixth paragraph of claim 9). However, claim 9 has been cancelled by this amendment, and it is therefore believed that this objection is moot.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112

Under this heading, the Examiner objects to claims 3 - 9 and 11 - 15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner's objections will

be considered in sequence with reference to the particular claims in respect of which the Examiner has raised the objections.

Claim 4

The Examiner objects to the reference to "a third cut" in this claim. However, by this Amendment, claim 4 is cancelled and therefore this objection becomes moot.

Claim 6

The Examiner objects to the term "secured" in this claim (in the phrase "the insert is secured"), saying that it is unclear to what element of the invention the insert is secured.

By this Amendment, claim 6 has been amended to clarify its wording. It is therefore believed that this objection has been overcome.

Claim 7

Here, the Examiner objects to the term "position" (in the phrase "the insert is secured in position"), saying that it is unclear. By this Amendment, claim 7 has been amended in similar fashion to claim 6. It is therefore believed that this objection has been overcome.

Claim 9

The Examiner raises various objections concerning claim 9. However, by this Amendment, claim 9 has been cancelled. These objections are therefore moot.

Claim 11

The Examiner objects to lines 1 and 2 of this claim, saying that it is unclear how the first and third side walls can form a channel for receiving the window glass. The Examiner points out that this recitation conflicts with the specification and Figure 3. Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out this mistake: claim 11 is amended hereby to bring it into line with the specification and Figure 3 and to specify that it is the second and third side walls which form the channel.

Claim 12

Here, the Examiner objects to the recitation of "first, second and third side walls" in line 2, because it is unclear if the sidewalls of the insert or the side walls of the channel arrangement are being specified.

By this Amendment, claim 12 has been amended to remove any indefiniteness.

Claim 15

Here, the Examiner objects to the phrase "the channel arrangement being bent" in line 7. This part of claim 15 has been deleted, and it is therefore believed that this objection is moot.

The Examiner also objects to the term "by means of" in the phrase "by means of a second cut" in line 16 of claim 15. By this Amendment, the words "means of" have been deleted from this phrase, thereby rendering this objection moot.

Finally, the Examiner objects to the recitation in lines 17 - 20 of claim 15 of "said separated distal edge region... angle at the corner". This passage has also been deleted, again rendering the objection moot.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103

The Examiner rejects claims 3 - 6, 8, 9 and 11 - 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.K. Patent Publication No. 2 311 799 in view of Christian (U.S. Patent No. 5,493,814). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In view of the cancellation by this Amendment of claims 4 and 9, the objections will not be discussed with reference to those claims.

Of the claims remaining in the application, claim 15 is the sole independent claim, on which the other claims depend, directly or indirectly.

Applicant has noted the Examiner's comments under the section headed "Response to Arguments", in particular relating to the effect of the third side wall in the invention as completely covering the first wall of the insert from view from the second to the first environment. Claim 15 (last paragraph) has been amended to clarify this fact. In the light of the Examiner's comments, it is believed that this amendment distinguishes claim 15 from the teaching of the cited art.

Applicant has also, though, considered the Examiner's discussion in detail concerning the alleged disclosure by Christian of a "third side wall" (wall 42). For completeness, Applicant wishes to refer again to the arguments put forward in the previous Amendment. As indicated therein, Applicant does not believe Christian does disclose a "third side wall", because the wall 42 in Christian does not have a "distal edge portion" - it has no "edges", being integrally joined with the first side wall to form a hollow chamber. In view of this, and the other arguments previously put forward, Applicant submits that the teaching of Christian does not lend itself to be combined in any way with the teaching of the U.K. Patent Publication - because there is no teaching from Christian how any "third side wall" could be incorporated into the disclosure or teaching of the U.K. Patent Publication in such position as to ensure that the third side wall (completely) covers the insert from view.

In view of these arguments, and the amendment made to the last paragraph of claim 15, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is patentably distinguished from any combination of the U.K. Patent Publication and Christian and is therefore allowable.

The remaining claims in the application which have been rejected over the U.K. Patent Publication and Christian are all dependent directly, or indirectly on claim 15, and are therefore believed to be allowable along with that claim; individual discussion is not believed to be necessary.

The Examiner rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over the U.K. Patent Publication in view of Christian and further in view of Kawai. However, claim 7 is dependent on claim 15 and includes all its limitations. For the reasons given above, claim 7 is therefore patentably distinguished over the teaching of the U.K. Patent Publication and Christian. Nothing shown in Kawai can adversely affect the distinction of claim 7 over the teaching of the U.K. Patent Publication and Christian. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 7 is patentably distinguished over the cited art. More specifically, the fact that


In re Appln. of Maass
Application No. 10/069,650

Kawai may show a molded insert is of no relevance to the specific features of the insert and the associated constructional features of the construction as claimed in claim 15 (and thus also in claim 7).

Conclusion

In summary, claims 3, 5 - 8, and 11 - 15 are in the application and are all believed to be allowable for the reasons stated. In view of the foregoing remarks, the application is considered to be in good and proper format for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Pamela J. Ruschau, Reg. No. 34,242
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: June 30, 2005

Amendment or ROA - Regular (Revised 11-23-04)